

### REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 are independent.

The examiner requested that an omitted figure 4 be included in this communication.

Applicant submitted a preliminary amendment dated March 21, 2002, correcting all references from FIG. 4 to FIG. 2C in the specification, correcting other typographical errors in the specification, adding new claims 25-31, and requesting approval of drawing changes. No new matter was added. Applicant kindly requests that the examiner acknowledge receipt of the March 21, 2002 preliminary amendment, a copy of which is attached for the convenience of the examiner.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct spelling errors, grammatical errors, and numbering errors. No new matter was added.

The examiner rejected claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-24 and 27-31 as failing to comply with the enabling requirement.

Applicant amended claims 3, 11, 19 and 27 to remove material not enabled in the specification. No new matter was added.

The examiner uses Branth to reject claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-26 and 28-30 as having been anticipated.

Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25, as amended, recite "modifying the linked list of addresses of the first queue entry based on the cell count of the first address retrieved, including decrementing the cell count of the first address each time the first address is retrieved," or similar language.

Branth neither describes nor suggests this quoted claim feature. Branth does nothing to manipulate a cell count but uses a cell count field to manage cell queue information:

**Count field 342 contains the number of cells in the cell queue for the multicast group. (Col. 8, line 15-16)**

Accordingly, claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 are not anticipated by Branth.

The examiner uses Branth and Adam to reject claims 7, 15, 23 and 31 as having been obvious.


Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 are not obvious in view of Branth and Adam. At a minimum, the cited references fail to teach or suggest modifying the linked list of addresses of the first queue entry based on the cell count of the first address retrieved, including decrementing the cell count of the first address each time the first address is retrieved. Claims 7, 15, 23 and 31 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 9, 17 and 25. Accordingly, claims 7, 15, 23 and 31 are not obvious in view of Branth and Adam.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050 referencing 10559-614001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 28, 2005

  
Kenneth F. Kozik  
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906